Document 79

Filed 02/09/2004

Page 1 of 1



04 FEB -2 AM 9: 25

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

granted Jan Bensen 15 ort

DARLINGTON AMADASU

CASE NO. C-1-01-0284

V.

(Spiegel/Sherman)

HEALTH ALLIANCE OF GREATER.
CINCINNATI, INC., et al
Defendants

MOTION FOR ENTENSION OF TIME TO OBJECT TO ORDERS [Doc.76 and 77]

## (A) MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S ORDER (Doc.76)

Lay Pro se Plaintiff shows unto this court that the time for him to object to Orders denying: (1) plaintiff's motion to strike defendants' motion for summary judgment (doc 76); (2) plaintiff's to strike the declaration of Sharyn Makrancy (doc.76); (3) plaintiff's motion for a protective order precluding the use of plaintiff's deposition testimony (doc.76), has not expired, and pursuant to Civ.R 6(b), moves the Court for an order extending the time to respond to the said Orders on or before February 28, 2004 for the reason, inter alia, of harrage orders, reports and recommendation (doc.77) recently served on Friday, January 30, 2004 on the plaintiff requiring more time to conduct research and respond adequately to each of the order.

## (B) MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT & RECOMMENDATION

Lay Pro se plaintiff also moves this court for entry of an order granting extension of time, pursuant to FRCP 6(b), to March 31, 2004, in which to file his objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (doc.77), served on plaintiff on Friday. January 30, 2004.

## MEMORANDUM

The Magistrate's order (doc.76) was served upon the plaintiff contemporaneously with the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation (doc.77). The orders (doc.76) consist of three separate orders, which plaintiff needs to object to separately and individually, thus needing extension of time to conduct research and respond appropriately.